

REMARKS

The Official Action dated June 30, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, claims 1, 2 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Accordingly, claims 3, 4 and 6-15 are presently pending in the instant application with claims 7-15 being withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner.

With reference initially to paragraph 11 of the Office Action, claims 3, 4 and 6 have again been indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record. In this regard, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, rejected claims 1, 2 and 17 have been cancelled and consequently, it is respectfully requested that claims 3, 4 and 6 again be indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record and that the present application be passed to issue.

With reference to paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 has again been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, claim 1 has been cancelled in its entirety without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Consequently further discussion with respect to the merits of this rejection is no longer believed to be warranted.

Referring now to paragraphs 5-8 of the Official Action, claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,691,556 issued to Saito et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed in that, as can be seen from the foregoing amendment, each of claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Accordingly, further discussion with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 2 as being unpatentable over Saito et al. is no longer believed to be warranted.

With reference to paragraph 9 of the Office Action, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, claim 17 has also been cancelled in its entirety without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Accordingly, further discussion with respect to the merits of the rejection of claim 17 as being unpatentable over Saito et al. in view of the teachings of Yu et al. is no longer believed to be warranted.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 3, 4 and 6 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald R. Studebaker
Registration No. 32,815

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000